

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
COMP PLAN UPDATE & DELIBERATIONS
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2003**

**BOCC HEARING ROOM, 6TH FLOOR
PSC BUILDING, 1300 FRANKLIN STREET
VANCOUVER, WA**

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor, Public Service Building, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Present: Dick Deleissegues, Ron Barca, Carey Smith, Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; and Vaughn Lein, Chair.

Planning Commission Absent: Lonnie Moss and Jada Rupley.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Colete Anderson, Planner II; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for November 3, 2003

The agenda for Monday, November 3, 2003, was approved as distributed.

B. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, continued

PLEASE NOTE: This hearing will focus on deliberations.

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.

Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.

Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.

A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.

LEIN: We continued the hearing from last Thursday, we were talking about comprehensive plan text update. We concluded with Chapter 5 and we were going on to Chapter 6. Before we do that, are there any comments, Mr. Lee?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEE: I guess Oliver has a comment.

ORJIAKO: Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Long-Range Planning. At the last hearing the Planning Commission raised some concern or issues on some of the tables that you've gone through so I just wanted to provide you some clarification of what we've done since that hearing. If you recall, staff promised that we will check the tables and get back to you. Table 1.2 on Page 1-4, it will be in the land use chapter.

LEE: Tab 3 on your notebook.

ORJIAKO: Tab 3, thank you, Pat. I would like to indicate that Table 1.2 with the heading "Historic and Projected Population by Jurisdiction," that table is accurate, all the figures in

there is accurate upon further check. I won't go into depth, but what is really happening, if you look at 1980, for example, or 1990, these are census, actual head count. If you look at the city of Vancouver, I'm not picking on them, but in 1990 there were less than 50,000 folks within the city limits. If you look at 2000 census count that almost quadrupled, but that's the result of the annexation that occurred in the late 1990s. If you then go back to the unincorporated rural area and the unincorporated urban area, it will appear as if the unincorporated rural area number is pretty small, which is the case, but that is a result of the majority of the annexation that occurred in the 1980s and '90s, that's what is reflected there. In the 2000 census the split is very close to 50/50. If you like, I will present you with the actual percentage, but that's to emphasize that Table 1.2 is accurate.

The other table that the Planning Commission raised some concern is if that Table 1.2 is accurate, then Table 2.1 need to be consistent with Table 1.2 and that's the information we have provided.

LEE: It's behind Tab 4.

ORJIAKO: Behind Tab 4 on Page 2-3. And I provided you a one sheet with a three-hole punch so that you can replace what you currently have. Table 2.1 is consistent with Table 1.2. The other table will be on Tab 5, Table 3.3, I've also provided you a one page correction with a three-hole punch so that you can replace the current one in your text. This primarily has to do with the table on the acreage of land uses in Clark County rural centers. Since the adoption of the '94 there haven't really been significant change in the rural centers boundary. There have been some minor changes from maybe commercial to residential or vice-a-versa, but the Meadow Glade numbers you read 1,286 and with that addition to commercial and industrial the total will then be accurate. Those are the clarification staff promised to make on the issues that staff, well, the Planning Commission raised on the tables. And I wouldn't say much, we can get into the discussion on the chapters, the remaining chapters.

LEE: Did that include the clarification, there was some minor expansion and some changes done in a few rural centers in 2000 or 2001?

ORJIAKO: That's reflected.

LEE: It is reflected? Okay.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: I need some further clarification, Oliver. Looking at Table 2.1, the two columns that I believe Lonnie brought into question, total unincorporated Clark County the year 2000, 166,279.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: "Total incorporated Clark County," now by definition that says to me that is all

cities?

ORJIAKO: Yes. If you add those two numbers together, it will equal 345,238.

BARCA: Okay. And I accept that.

ORJIAKO: Okay.

BARCA: Now if we go to Table 1.2 --

ORJIAKO: Okay.

BARCA: -- which is in 1 dash, Page 1-4 --

ORJIAKO: Okay.

BARCA: -- the two columns that Lonnie brought into question, unincorporated rural area, the same number, 166,279 --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: -- the second column, or excuse me, second row, unincorporated urban area, now unincorporated that tells me that we're speaking of areas of the urban growth boundary but not annexed into the city, is that the correct definition of that?

ORJIAKO: That total will include city, the population within the city limits, and what is unincorporated.

BARCA: So the terminology "unincorporated urban area" isn't correct?

ORJIAKO: We can modify that, yes.

BARCA: Okay. Because I believe that that was part of Lonnie's issue last week and why it shouldn't in his mind have added up to the total population of Clark County.

ORJIAKO: You may be correct, I can't speak for Lonnie, but I think it was more than that. It appears as if there was something added through policy or some other action that the County is doing deliberately to that result in the lower, lowering of the population in the rural area, but I can't speak for Lonnie, but, yes, that unincorporated urban area need to be modified, the 179, 178,959 should include city limits and the unincorporated portion of the city limits.

BARCA: So it's more appropriate to use the same terminology that you have on Table 2.1 --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: -- "total incorporated Clark County"?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: Okay.

LEIN: Any other questions of Oliver? Thank you for clarifying those.

ORJIAKO: Thank you. It tells me you're reading it. No problem.

LEIN: Okay. Anything else before we move on to Chapter 6? Which is Chapter 8 in your book.

ORJIAKO: Tab 8.

LEIN: Excuse me, Capital Facilities and Utilities Element, no major policy changes?

ORJIAKO: No.

SMITH: On Table 6.2, Summary of Estimated Clark County Facilities Expenditures, under "funding sources" you never use general fund on those, yet in the definitions "general fund" says "general fund moneys are often used to finance capital improvement projects." Funding source Page 6-4. Wouldn't general fund go towards some of those funding sources or are we just listing those that are above and beyond general fund?

(Commissioner Wriston entered the meeting.)

ORJIAKO: These are listed in the manner that where we know the actual funding or actual amount.

SMITH: Okay. So we just take it for granted that there will be general funds sprinkled through there?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEIN: We're just starting on Chapter 6 which is 8 in your book.

BARCA: So spring boarding off of Carey's question, the way that the column on Table 6.2 looks for funding sources, this shows that many of the services or utilities are using contributed capital for the sake of being able to finance the expansion of the systems basically in that fashion, I'd say that these are being used from existing ratepayers to fund the expansion for new hookups and services; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: Yes. Yes.

BARCA: And is there some provisions in GMA specifically, I'll put this to Rich, about the ability to fund expansions of these utilities using existing ratepayer funds?

LEE: Rich, do you want to put the microphone closer.

LOWRY: Rich Lowry, County Prosecutor's Office. The utilities or the County comprehensive plan is required to include a utility element for sewer, water, that meets GMA's requirements for a capital facilities plan which does include required revenue forecasts to show that needed improvements can be funded.

BARCA: Okay. Beyond the aspect of hookup fees -- or what I'm looking at is how much of the ratepayer charges on their regular billing cycle is being utilized towards the aspect of funding expansion of the system?

LOWRY: And you're talking about sewer and water specifically?

BARCA: Sewer and water is the ones that come up here where they say "contributing capital."

LOWRY: Right. I am not that familiar, I'm not familiar at all with the capital facilities plans. Just remember also that their plans haven't yet been updated to include any of the expansion areas so that work hasn't been yet done. I think it true that in general the monthly fees pay for operation and the hookup fees pay for capital expansion.

BARCA: Okay. Then I guess I'm going to question what "contributed capital" means?

LEE: Well, we'll get back to you on Thursday specifically with what that means.

BARCA: Thank you.

SMITH: You might check your math on Table 6.10 on Page 6-20. It doesn't look like the square footage for the County Owned-County Occupied buildings add up.

LEE: Yeah, it does.

ORJIAKO: On Page 6-20?

SMITH: On 6-20 that first column.

LEE: The first column, I thought you were talking about the last column.

SMITH: No, the first column doesn't.

WRISTON: Have you added it?

SMITH: Well, the first number should be 9 and it's a 5 so that told me you can't get any

better from there.

BARCA: Details.

LEE: You're apparently right there.

WRISTON: That's a good catch.

LEIN: It's not off by far, I come up with 603979.

WRISTON: Yeah. No, at first blush it wouldn't be off that far, but he's -- and I guess it's possible it could be rounding in there and not down to the total.

SMITH: If they're reporting it in inches originally, yeah.

WRISTON: Yeah, it could be a metric conversion too, right.

LEIN: Rich, a question. In terms of the total dollar values of all this for the County portion of that, is that something that can be challenged by the Hearings Board?

LOWRY: Well, there isn't the specificity in the Act in terms of dealing with total County buildings and the costs for police and all that sort of thing as there is for the capital facilities plans for the utilities and roads and schools. So it can be challenged but there's not as much of a hook in the Act to justify it. I'm not sure on what basis it would be challenged, it's merely a discussion of projected needs and revenues.

LEIN: Can they challenge the revenue sources? Because in some cases, you know, we'll see grants, things that they've been traditionally getting, you know, from the Feds or the States over the years but --

LOWRY: Right.

LEIN: -- are sort of an unknown.

LOWRY: I have not seen a challenge successful or not on these general revenue projections. I mean the challenges that are more commonly seen are on the capital facilities plan.

SMITH: On Page 6-17, Table 6.9, Fire District 5 is not included and I don't see any fire districts in Vancouver.

LEIN: The City would have their own fire so -- but they reach out past the urban area. And although there's an agreement with Fire District 5 on providing services, I don't know how they break it down in terms of providing facilities.

ORJIAKO: I'm sure that with the annexation that occurred in 1990 very little of District 5

now is outside the city limits.

LEIN: There's actually quite a bit north.

DELEISSEGUES: East.

LEIN: And east because it ties in then to District 3.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, at least to the north.

ORJIAKO: We will ask Fire District 5 on the areas that they covered so that it maybe should be included.

LEIN: Well, I don't know. Budgetarily I know they're building a fire station, the City is funding a fire station out in the rural area so I don't know if that comes under the City plan in terms of funding or if it needs to go into a District 5 plan, that would be a clarification we'd need to get.

ORJIAKO: Okay.

LEIN: Anything else on the Capital Facilities Element concerns or questions?

BARCA: The question that I posed to you earlier in which you said you were going to come back on Thursday for an answer, I believe my thought process was sparked by me looking at part of the goals that are in place on Page 6-33. I'll point out specifically the goal at 6.10.8 about the pursuance of true cost pricing policy, and when I had asked Rich earlier about it it was because I couldn't remember the language specifically but I was able to dig it up. So when you come back on that question on what it means from contributed capital would you kind of frame it in the aspect of what this policy is from our goals.

LEIN: I've got a question under Policy 6.2 on Page 6-27. It says that they'll recognize CPU as a satellite water system management agency for Clark County. What is the purpose of it being called a "satellite"? It has a fairly extensive service area.

LEE: I'm assuming that that means that it's although it does provide water service to some municipalities as well, it largely provides water service outside of city limits.

LEIN: To rural area?

LEE: Yeah. Right.

LEIN: Because I think it serves Hockinson and the area there, it serves over to Hazel Dell area.

LEE: Yeah. I mean it has quite an extensive rural system and I think that is probably what the term was getting at.

LEIN: Okay. Anything else on Chapter 6? Let's move on to Chapter 7, Park, Recreation and Open Space Element. I think you heard two of the Parks people before us at the meeting before last, two meetings ago, whatever it was, provide us an update on the parks master plan. There appears to be no major policy changes in the chapter. So are there any questions on this one? I think we've heard this at least twice, if not three times, in the last year and a half so. If nothing, let's move on, then, to Economic Development Element, Chapter 9. Excuse me. What about Chapter 8, Oliver, Historical and Archeological.

ORJIAKO: There are no new major changes.

LEIN: No changes, okay.

DELEISSEGUES: What did we do with 7, Chapter 7?

LEIN: Did we miss, 7 was Parks and Recreation, that's the one we just covered. You got to stay up with us, otherwise we're moving. Okay. So Chapter 8 didn't change. It's a very short chapter concerning Historic, Archeological and Cultural Preservation Element.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

LEIN: So Chapter 9, Economic Development Element.

ORJIAKO: This is a chapter that is completely new. The Planning Commission recall we did present this in a joint work session with the PC and the Board. The emphasis here is pretty much on aggressive our job growth and issues relating to knowledge base and how to grow jobs in Clark County. There have been a lot of input from the business, the development community, in drafting the economic development strategy about two years ago and that serves as the basis for rewriting this chapter. There was other input from the Town Youth commission and other effort that was made in putting this chapter together. The Board also had numerous stakeholders meeting. I couldn't say more in terms of the process that went into the development of this chapter, but it's brand-new.

LEIN: Now this has been sort of the driver from the Board, that is, the economic development aspect of things?

ORJIAKO: Yes. The only policy that I will probably call the Planning attention to is on Page 9-13. I brought it up as one of the countywide planning policies. It's actually 9.1.12 dealing with the major rural industrial land bank. You will find that policy on Page 9-13 and it is 9.1.12. There's a minor change that we will make there, but if you read the policy the way it's written here, we've worked it over with the Cities. The only change here will be changing the "shall" in the first line of that policy to "may." And the other policy that I will call your attention to --

BARCA: Excuse me, Oliver, can you repeat that, what you're stating would be the change.

ORJIAKO: On Page 9-13.

BARCA: Right, I'm with you on that and 9.1.12.

ORJIAKO: Yes. It is following consultation with interested Cities, the County, change the "shall" to "may."

BARCA: "May."

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

ORJIAKO: The other policy that the PC may consider is on Page 9-14 and this will be Policy 9.3.5. This touched upon the no net loss policy as is currently written which affects the unincorporated portions of the county. Our recommendation will be that this policy include no net loss of not only industrial land but also business park and office campus. If you recall at my last testimony I indicated that it may be appropriate to not include lands classified as "tertiary" in rewriting this policy, so it may only be consider amending the comprehensive plan map and rezoning of secondary industrial land. You can also include business park and office campus to non, to other nonindustrial uses, that will be our only recommendation. And as you consider the no net loss policy we also was recommending at our last testimony that there be some recommendation coming from the Planning Commission that that no net loss policy be countywide. There is a concern that we need some recommendation on that issue coming from the PC to the Board.

LEIN: When you say "countywide" are you including the rural area --

ORJIAKO: Well --

LEIN: -- in terms of the, we've got --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEIN: -- the rural centers?

ORJIAKO: Heavy manufacturing out there should be countywide, yes.

LEIN: And you're going to get rid of the tertiary? Is that your recommendation?

ORJIAKO: That's our recommendation.

LEE: Not -- yes. That doesn't mean we're redesignating the tertiary at this point, it means that it would not be constrained by the no net loss policy. Is that correct?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEIN: So then you're going to rewrite that sentence?

ORJIAKO: We would like to rewrite that, yes, with your recommendation.

LEIN: If we agree with the countywide application of no net loss of industrial and business park?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: What considerations have been given towards the aspect of jobs created in the rural lands? Based on the testimony that we've been hearing from the Home Occupation Ordinance, we're looking at something in the neighborhood of 2,000, 4,000 existing jobs. I don't believe that they're being counted in the inventory right now.

LEE: You're correct. In terms of the employment figures, the 84,000 that we're shooting for over the 20-year period that's strictly additions to the urban growth and the existing urban growth job creation and does not include all the self-employment or small businesses out in the rural area.

BARCA: So if we move towards a policy that tries to compliment the establishment of those style of jobs in there are we going to put that in this particular chapter as well and then go ahead and document some number for rural job growth?

LEE: I mean if you wanted to do that in terms of documentation of what may be happening in terms of total job creation, you can certainly do that. We have not done it since really calculating the job growth in the urban growth areas existing and expanded really is necessary in order to make a recommendation about what size the urban growth boundary should be.

BARCA: Well, I also look at it from the standpoint that we're setting a target on jobs to houses for a ratio and it seems appropriate to include those numbers in the overall growth, so I would like to see the Planning Commission at least bring that forward as a recommendation. If we're going to pass this Home Occupation Ordinance with the idea of trying to facilitate the ability to continue growing jobs in the rural area, we count this as part of the energy, effort and money that is expended from the County's coffers to facilitate that job growth. Does anybody on the Planning Commission have anything to say about that?

WRISTON: What are you saying, that the, I don't know, I'm not understanding. You're saying that -- I mean are you saying that the County would help to facilitate that or that we count that as part

of -- I mean I'm not going to be facetious, but, I mean, the Home Occupation Ordinance fees and things like that as they're proposed anyway, I mean they seem to cover themselves I mean. Are you recommending that the County get more proactive in promoting those types of business and then counting them or --

BARCA: I'm saying that we are in essence creating an ordinance that would allow that job growth to take place, and yet in our 20-year vision we're not taking any credit for that job facilitation growth and establishment.

WRISTON: Well, a lot of people would argue that we're creating the ordinance that's going to hinder. I mean the bulk of these businesses exist out there and now we're saying and the struggle we're having is you either need to conform or you're going to have to pay these fees and come into, you know, conformance. Or one of the biggest things we're trying to do is figure out how we're going to get these under the umbrella and I think we are -- it's not a facilitating ordinance more than a housekeeping and control ordinance, thank you, and I'm not, I don't know. I mean I'm not saying that they shouldn't be counted, I'm not saying at all that they shouldn't be counted in terms of our job growth in the county, but I don't view the Home Occupation Ordinance as an encouragement to home occupation, I think it's a discouragement to home occupation businesses.

BARCA: Well, I guess that's somewhat in the way we craft it now.

WRISTON: No, it is, that is. I mean we're probably premature in talking -- I mean you're right, it absolutely is. I mean it would be nice to the way the world's going with technology and everything else to make it easier on people, but I don't know how we're going to do that given where we are, where we stand today but --

BARCA: I think the real issue that I wanted to bring forward was the idea that we're not taking any credit for those jobs that do exist, nor are we --

WRISTON: Right.

BARCA: -- proposing that we count any future growth out there as part of the jobs to housing ratio and I think it's wholly appropriate that the rural sector contribute as it stands based on ground truthing that there is some of it now and I would anticipate it growing.

LEE: If you want to do that, then I would suggest that you also get a handle on what the job creation potential would be on currently, quote, unquote, developed but empty industrial and commercial sites in the urban growth boundary which would bump up that 84,000 job creation total further because the way we've got to that total and how we're sizing the urban growth boundary is based on vacant and underutilized land. So if you have a parcel that is developed that may have had jobs in 2000 and then redevelops, much like a lot of the activity that's gone on in downtown Vancouver over the last several years, that increase in job creation is not reflected in the numbers either.

BARCA: And that was going to be my second point, thank you. I do believe that we aren't taking into effect the statistics that have been presented towards the aspect of redevelopment and job growth and the information that the City of Vancouver brought forward and what I'm seeing out of the metro area shows a significant number that isn't being reflected and I would like to see that information brought forward and adopted by the County.

ORJIAKO: The only thing I can also add is that you mention a job/housing balance or ratio in the rural area, that's going to be difficult to do when in fact, you know, if you look at the rural area, in some cases you're looking at really a public sector which may be in some cases DNR, in some cases schools, and in some if you stretch that further you have a majority of these folks living in the urban area and commuting to the rural area, be it in the forestry or whatever the case may be. So advocating for a housing balance in the rural area would be difficult to do in my opinion.

BARCA: I don't think I was advocating for a job/housing balance in the rural area exclusively, I was just asking for the jobs that are in the rural sector that haven't been credited towards this plan currently in the comp plan that we get credit for them and help add to that as it helps make the goals in which we've set, which is a very aggressive set of goals, and we need to take into account places where we're really having some success and there is something on the ground that we can prove.

ORJIAKO: Well, maybe I (inaudible) your last comment, Ron, but in terms of job/housing balance in the rural area that will be difficult to do.

BARCA: No, Oliver, I think you did misunderstand. It was never exclusively --

LEE: I think I understand. I mean it might be useful to recognizing that it would be rough numbers, but in addition to the 84,000 we're looking to on vacant and underutilized land, you could have a table that indicated estimated rural jobs and another one that estimated redevelopment jobs that would add to that total. Is that what you're getting at?

BARCA: Yeah. And it might be a combination of all of those things that gets us to settle on what our final numbers look like when we start proposing the aspect of having to grow the urban growth boundary towards the aspect of industrial or commercial lands or office park or whatever the options turn out to be to try and get that aggressive job growth that we're speaking of in the terms of the comp plan policies.

LEIN: Ron, do you see it impacting anything within the urban area? I mean right now it's based on the vacant and buildable land. Would you use the figures from the outside to reduce the amount of inside space needed?

BARCA: Reduce the inside space.

LEIN: For that potential job growth?

BARCA: I would say what Pat brought up was a point that I was going to be making, which is indeed that the redevelopment number show that we're getting a lot more job development than we have credited ourselves for in this comp plan at this point in time. So I would think that if we agree upon some number that we can put forward that it would dramatically change the amount of extension that any type of a growth would require, and there may be a point in time where within the existing urban growth boundary some of the

land that we review goes towards office park or mixed use in that regard where currently it's zoned something else, perhaps it's a commercial or an industrial designation in its existing format. So I guess to try and answer your question, within the urban growth boundary I could see us changing zoning based on what we see with redevelopment numbers.

LEIN: Okay.

SMITH: I always have a real hard time with goals, what's a goal versus what's a strategy, and in here a lot of your goals look more like strategies. Like continue to identify targeted industries, is that a goal or is that a strategy? There's a lot that fall under that category. And I can't find one of these goals that really is measurable as to whether you're reaching that goal. We don't have anything, we don't say what number we'd like to shoot for as far as unemployment is concerned, we don't say what's an acceptable rate of commuters back and forth across the bridge. We identify those are problems and then we talk about a lot about goals and strategies, but I mean almost every one of these goals looks more like a strategy than a goal, and to me a goal is how many people do we want unemployed, what's our average salary that we're looking for in the community or how many people should really be going across that bridge and then these things that look like goals look like strategies to meet those. I don't know. What do you guys think?

DELEISSEGUES: They're not measurable, that's for sure.

SMITH: They sure aren't measurable.

BARCA: Well, let's look at the aspect of what we can really do in that regard. What we have right --

SMITH: We could at least set targets.

BARCA: Well, and I say, what we have right now are we have some overarching numbers in the aspect of a job to housing ratio, we have a top end number of how many jobs we want to create over the lifetime of the plan, and short of that I don't believe we have a lot more specifics in there that we're shooting for. But I do agree with you, I think the aspect of when we start looking at this if we are to get a definition of what we're looking for in the form of family wage jobs in the aspect of job to housing ratio may be more appropriate than even a top end number because they are the factors that are going to control both sides of that. And as we see the housing market continue to be hot and if the job market is cool, we're going to start to see an imbalance that over a period of time that we might want to make an adjustment on long before we worry about hitting a top end, it will just trying to get us back into that balance that we said we wanted to try and move towards.

LEIN: Well, if I look at Page 9-8 and it talks about wage, wages there, and they've got an average, the family threshold family wage in 2002 was 42,245 and it says then the last paragraph on the page "the threshold family wage is measured by calculating the County's average covered wage, plus 25 percent," so is that saying that we've got one that's about

\$50,000 a year, 51,000 for a family wage?

WRISTON: You go back, you back down the other way, don't you?

BARCA: 42,000 is 125 percent.

WRISTON: You go back the other way.

LEIN: So it goes back to 30 some?

WRISTON: Yeah.

BARCA: Yeah, it's about 36,000 then.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEIN: Okay. But then you look at some of the industries that are being targeted to come in and what are they building and what kind of wages are they producing. That's a concern I have. You know, if we're going to target industries that have a higher wage, what do you do when other industry comes in and they're taking up valuable land but their wages aren't as high and their jobs per acre is very low.

LEE: If I can make a comment. In the existing comp plan there was a whole section about key indicators for plan monitoring and basically we've substituted the buildable lands legislation which has a narrower focus for that annual monitoring report work. One thing I suppose the Planning Commission could consider if they would like to identify some indicators that we could look at through the monitoring program integrated with the buildable lands work, but I would hope there would not be as many as the 26 indicators that are articulated in the existing plan because it was very difficult to try and access data of any meaning for a lot of those indicators.

BARCA: Didn't CREDC have some benchmarks that they also were monitoring or I believe put forward to be monitored? Does that strike a bell with anybody?

ORJIAKO: That's correct. And I don't think we have information on those benchmarks since it was adopted in '94. There may have been some attempt by EDC to, you know, put some of that information together, but I cannot speak for EDC. Some of that was identified in the '94 plan that was adopted, but I --

LEIN: Well, I think they put out a (inaudible) paper on that over the last three or four years that we've had a copy of if I'm not mistaken.

ORJIAKO: That may be true. I don't --

LEIN: I remember seeing something from them.

BARCA: Yeah, but I think it was just once in that period of time since '94 that I've seen them come out with a review of that. Is it possible to ask CREDC for what they have in the way of monitoring numbers and when was the last time that they checked their benchmarks?

LEE: Sure.

ORJIAKO: We can.

WRISTON: You know, along those lines I was going to ask actually, it's always kind of baffled me and I've always kind of wondered where we get these largest employer numbers from CREDC. And I don't know how they figure them and I don't even know how often they update them. This says 2002. As of today I know my company is 297 employees and we have some Oregon operations, but then again Clark County and, you know, we have Oregon employees but then again Clark County and Safeway, Fred Meyer, the City of Vancouver, some of these that say 1500, you know, I wonder, I wonder how they're worked out. But I mean the vast majority of our employees are Clark County citizens and we're 297 and we're manufacturing, not that I want to have the, you know, the honor of being on this list, but I question whether these are manufacturing companies, you know, whether, you know, if you look at all these, these are all companies that CREDC would want to attract.

I would venture to say that our company, you know, well, I probably shouldn't say that by the way, but our family wage, we probably have more family wage jobs as a percentage of jobs than some of these companies. I mean if you took a look at our 297 and how many are, quote, unquote, family wage versus the percentage of the 1200 employees or whatever you want to, you know, pick out on some of those companies, I don't know, but I think we really got to be careful on how we put our foot forward in terms of what we say are the largest employers and we don't want to say these are the employers we want to attract. I don't believe these numbers just because it's something -- and the other thing is I think you have a typo here on Matsushita, I think it's meant to be 250.

ORJIAKO: I can speak to that issue. We go to EDC, they compile this information and some of them are (inaudible) through for an interview, I'm not sure how they collect it, but that have been the source that we've been using for quite some time. This was May 2002, maybe in this case you may take talk to your own folks when EDC calls, let them give them that correct number. But that's the --

WRISTON: Well, there are ways, I think, I guess I'm just going on, he disappeared on me, but I guess I'm going on the point that someone brought up, and I think it was Ron, and it may be, and I agree with you, we don't want 26 or whatever you said in terms of benchmarks, but some of these things, the employment base, and I can't tell you exactly where you get it, but I know that there's a way to get it outside of, you know, through the Census Bureau or something that might be a more accurate way of doing it rather than going through CREDC.

LEIN: Well, I think, I know, we get several inquiries a year doing from the Chamber sometimes, from CREDC, from Vancouver Business Journal, how many employees do you have at that time of the year.

WRISTON: Right.

LEIN: So, you know, we send that in and that's the figures they use, and I don't know how much --

WRISTON: But there's got to be a (inaudible) --

LEIN: -- sharing there is between the groups. But I mean you're only going to be as accurate as the information that people give you.

WRISTON: Well, I agree, but there's got to be a more -- these days I mean the employment base I think has got to be reported to some, I mean, you know, Labor and Industries for instance.

LEE: The Department of Employment Security --

WRISTON: Something.

LEE: -- would keep a record of all covered employees, but it would not count the --

WRISTON: If we want to say these are Clark County's largest employers, we ought to be accurate in what we say. CREDC is not a, you know, I mean that's not their job and I would -- I mean a very simple thing, you're right, Labor and Industries would be another one or Employment Security or something, very quick and easy thing to do, we're required, and that, you're right. I mean when people call up and ask you for a, you know, we want to know how many employees you have or, you know, that's like giving, people get really, you know, worried about, you know, we want to know what your costs are, you know, it's things like that, you know, we're not, you know, people get. That's why I say we want to -- if you don't want all these indicators but the indicators that we do have, we ought to get accurate information on and I'm not sure that CREDC is the best source for some of this information.

I think, you know, it came up in a couple of ways that you were just asking, you know, can we go back to CREDC, I'm not sure they're the best source. I'm not saying they're not, but there may, there may be other sources to get some of this information. So I just want to throw that out too because I did notice that and I did notice that there was -- you might want to check the numbers again there as well.

BARCA: Let me clarify, then, just the reason I asked for that was it was because it was their benchmarks.

WRISTON: No. Right. And CREDC's benchmarks.

BARCA: Yeah. So I don't know who else to go back to for their benchmarks besides them.

WRISTON: I'm not sure they're the best benchmarks to use. I don't know, I'm just going to throw that out, but for now, I mean, I think we're, that's what the direction we've gone. But, you know, but we're relying on an organization that kind of ebbs and flows and is outside of Clark County itself, independent. I know we have dealings with them. I don't know exactly what, how it all works with CREDC, but I'm not sure it's the best, it's a good source, but I'm not sure it's the best source in certain circumstances.

BARCA: Well, let's rephrase it, then, in that regard. Are there other benchmarks out there that we can use and start to establish the aspects of numbers to quantify whether we're succeeding or failing in the goals that we set for ourselves? I think the discussion earlier that Carey and I were pushing back and forth in the aspect of firm numbers would state that we're establishing some numbers from here on out towards the plan and the question then came back of, you know, the 26 indicators that were in the original comp plan, perhaps it's worthwhile to go back and look at those indicators, pick some important ones of those that would then dovetail with these hard numbers that we're looking at here in the economic model and start from here on out and ignore the CREDC ones for the future if indeed what you're saying is data gathering is not their forte.

WRISTON: I don't know. I mean Bonneville Power, does -- Bonneville Power has 3,000 people up on the hill there, I guess they could. I live right there, it seems like --

BARCA: The rest are contractors.

WRISTON: I don't know. I mean it just -- there are enough -- if you go through these numbers, there are enough that makes you kind of wonder where those numbers are coming from and they're being reported from and that in and of itself what are the reporting parameters. I mean like you said, Pat, it might be better not for necessarily to get this moving forward, but in the future it might be better maybe to figure out some source that's almost mandatory that you report it accurately and --

LEE: I mean --

WRISTON: From an employment standpoint I think those exist because we're all required to submit to any number of government agencies.

ORJIAKO: We will, sure, we will do that, we will continue to monitor all these publications because they are published in some cases. The Chamber, as Vaughn indicated, do publish this, sometimes we get it from the Vancouver Business Journal, but they're published. And we've relied on the EDC work for quite some time and in some cases it's in the County Economic Handbook which is published yearly. So there are sources where this information are published and the following year we check and update it so for now and this is the most current at the time that this report was put together.

WRISTON: Right. And I'm, and again I'm not saying that we don't move this report forward, I'm saying in the future we ought to get some of these things. There are membership organizations and there's just, I think we can get better information, but we should cut down, way down on your, I don't remember how many you said.

LEE: I think it was at 26.

WRISTON: 26 key indicators, we should be able to cut that down. I mean there's, you know, we're going to get paralyzed by information, we should be able to cut that way down in terms of things that are really relevant to look at. Would you agree with that? I mean there's got to be a way to that somebody looks at --

LEE: Yeah, what I was going to suggest, and I don't know how you want to handle it, I would suggest that maybe we have a work session at some point and review those indicators that they are --

WRISTON: Brainstorm it or something.

LEE: -- try and identify the sources of information that we are aware of that publish that and see what we think at that point and see if we need to maybe tune-up some indicators, maybe we can, you know, shake the trees and see if there is other sources of data out there that are helpful.

WRISTON: Maybe the Auditor's Office could help us a little bit. I don't know what they --

LEE: Well, you're, I mean you're right, a lot of -- when it comes to certainly private sector employment a lot of companies --

WRISTON: Close to the vest.

LEE: -- are very close to the vest about that. So it's always something that many companies are reluctant to provide that information which probably explains why some of it is not of the quality that we would like it to be.

WRISTON: Or they just don't return calls or maybe they don't want to be bothered --

LEIN: Or check their E-mails.

WRISTON: -- or they don't fill out the form or they don't answer E-mails. I mean there's any number of -- I mean how many numbers do you employ is not a, usually not a huge secret. I mean some of these basic deals usually aren't a huge secret, but that, you're right --

LEE: Full-time employees, full-time, part-time, combined, you know, what --

WRISTON: Well, a lot of that information is out there just as a matter of course that you

have to report it one way or another to someone. So anyway, all right, enough said on that.

SMITH: Well, another number that I'd like us see us look at is the number employed in Oregon. Right now we're setting that according to April 2002 at 25 percent, it would be nice to have a target of 15 percent and work towards something like that as a goal that's measurable. I don't know if it's possible, but I know when I set my employees goals, it's something I can measure.

WRISTON: Yeah, one of those yellow stickies, you know.

LEIN: Any other comments or question on the Economic Development?

BARCA: Yeah. I would like to discuss just for a moment the aspect of what kind of economic contribution the rural area is making towards the County economy right now. In 1998 there was information out concerning the productivity of Multnomah County and Clark County. Multnomah County has almost exactly the same numbers of resource land designation in ag and forest as Clark County does, but they were producing about five times as much per acre as Clark County was. And at the time I questioned the aspects of what it was going to take to try and move Clark County towards more productivity per acre, and I was working with the Washington State University Extension Office at the time and it seemed to be one of the issues that was too big for any one jurisdiction to try and work towards, but I believe that there's a very viable opportunity here for the County to enhance the view of the rural resource lands and its value towards the economic model in the County and I don't believe that we're getting full credit now for what the contributions are. The Equestrian Group that Frank Funk is president of, the name of the group escapes me at the moment, he gave us some data a little while back into this organization talking about how much money was generated from horse related industry.

LEE: That particular example might be difficult to relate back to resource designations because it could happen on rural as well as resource land designation.

BARCA: And what you're saying is true in that regard. But I think there's an entire combination of what the rural lands do contribute. And I don't think that we're going to be able to get down to the aspect of all the acreages, it may very well be just in the form of agricultural production regardless of whether it's resource land or not, but I think there's some measurable ways of doing it, I just don't know what they are at the moment. I think we're missing that and I'd like to see us try and put our finger on that somehow.

LEE: DNR used to put out sort of an annual report, but I haven't seen one since maybe the early '90s so I don't know if it's something that they continue to do.

BARCA: And I think that may very well have been just softwood fiber production if I recall correctly, basically what was logged and taken off.

LEE: Well, they also had agricultural figures as well. But again, I'm not sure that those

figures are still maintained. We can certainly ask if they are. Personally I would be faced with the same challenge that you are, is that I don't know if that information is easily retrievable. I doubt if it's in one source alone. You know, I tend to start off with the State resource agencies as keeping track in terms of whatever their definition of productivity may be on such lands.

BARCA: I'd be interested to see if we could dig something up. Just from the standpoint as we look at the overall goals in the economic model, I think it's valuable to understand what that contribution is if it's possible.

LEIN: Anything else on Economic Development? We move on, then, to Community Design Element, Chapter 10.

ORJIAKO: Very minor change.

WRISTON: No change?

ORJIAKO: No change.

WRISTON: Okay.

LEIN: It has the countywide planning policies in it so it can't be --

ORJIAKO: Well, remember, we -- you really wanted me to say something. We did move the existing countywide planning policies to this relevant chapter so that's the only thing you will see here, but there are no changes.

WRISTON: You didn't slip anything in, did you?

ORJIAKO: No.

WRISTON: All right. Just making sure.

LEE: Only as it relates to mineral industries.

WRISTON: Huh?

LEE: Only as it relates to mineral industries.

WRISTON: Yeah. No, believe me, I'm reading.

LEIN: Any comments or questions on this chapter? Going on to Chapter 11 then, Annexation/Incorporation. I'm assuming there's no changes in here?

ORJIAKO: That's true. The only area that we probably will have to take a second look at is on Page 11-2 dealing with the "Annexation Methods and Procedures." We will take a

second look at that. As you know, the Washington State Supreme Court had a ruling on annexation recently and I think the Legislature did pass new annexation rules, if you will, so we will take a look at that and make sure that what we said on this table is consistent with those rulings in the recent legislation.

WRISTON: Do we need to be so specific? I think that's an evolving area of law and maybe we --

ORJIAKO: You're right. You're right. If you look at the last paragraph we tried to address that issue that it is in flux and but again, we will take a look at what is currently in the books.

WRISTON: Probably need more than that little table. No, I'm just --

ORJIAKO: Okay.

WRISTON: I'm just trying to figure it out.

BARCA: Oliver --

ORJIAKO: Yes, sir.

BARCA: -- on Page 11-3 --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: -- Countywide Planning Policy 10.0.2 and 10.0.5, other than the fact of it says in one case "no city or town may annex" and the other one says "no city or town located in a county in which urban growth areas have been designated may annex," what's the difference between those two things? I'm having trouble understanding why they're both in there.

ORJIAKO: Not a whole difference. It may be one of redundant policy, but I don't see a major difference.

LEE: The only exception that I could think about would be Woodland which is largely based in the adjacent county but actually has a small portion which is in Clark County and I don't know that -- is any of the urban area of Woodland in Clark County?

ORJIAKO: I'm not sure, I'd have to check, but there may be a portion.

LEE: A small portion of the Woodland urban growth boundary is in Clark County --

BARCA: It's across the river?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEE: -- so that might be why it's phrased that way.

LOWRY: The second version is more accurate in terms of what the law says.

BARCA: So 10.0.5 would basically cover our needs?

LOWRY: Yes.

LEE: If you'd like us to strike 0.2, we can do that.

BARCA: I think Oliver summed it up when he said it was redundant.

LEE: Okay.

ORJIAKO: We can strike that and let our Cities know it's a countywide planning policy, we probably wrote them twice.

BARCA: Do we have to have a separate hearing on that now?

ORJIAKO: No.

LEIN: Actually it shouldn't even be 10, it should be 11 point something throughout that whole thing.

BARCA: Now you did it.

ORJIAKO: Now you caught that.

LEIN: Because it is Chapter 11 and so all those 10s should be 11 I would say.

ORJIAKO: Right. That's what cut and paste does for you.

LEE: Sorry we tried to sneak that one through.

LEIN: You leave us the big ones to catch though, don't you?

ORJIAKO: Right.

WRISTON: Carey got a two digit math error, that was pretty impressive.

LEIN: Any other questions on Chapter 11? Okay. Let's move on to Chapter 12, some minor technical change.

ORJIAKO: That's true, except that this is consistent, this is pretty much our procedural chapter. There are no policies or goals in this chapter, it's mainly procedural and issues of coordination and so forth. The only area that depending on what comes out of the

Planning Commission in terms of recommendation on the urban holding language, that's where we will make some changes. Beginning on Page 12-5 you have the urban holding language and I believe Bob will be discussing the proposed language, and I'm sure in your deliberation you may want something different, but whatever your recommendation is we will insert that on this page and the rest because it covers individual urban growth areas, that's something that will be new.

LEIN: Okay. So when we get to the plan text changes and then discuss urban holding, this may get modified.

ORJIAKO: Vaughn.

LEIN: Yes, sir.

ORJIAKO: The only thing else I will mention is in the appendix, if you go to Appendix D, that will be the last I believe two pages.

LEIN: Now which appendix are you going to?

ORJIAKO: D.

LEIN: D?

ORJIAKO: As in David.

LEE: The last two pages in the notebook.

LEIN: The last three pages, okay.

ORJIAKO: Yes. Again, we did discuss this with the Planning Commission and the Board, I can't remember the work session, but here our primary emphasis is on the strategy and action plan that if we, the County, and back on I think we can be successful in the coming years. Primarily focusing on the three strategies that we outlined, we would like the Planning Commission to also recommend that this be part of the comp plan text and part of the chapter dealing with Economic Development.

WRISTON: Well, I like reduce regulatory barriers, got a lot of work to do though. Put us out of business though; right?

BARCA: That would be we have a lot of work to do.

WRISTON: Right, that's what I said.

BARCA: The aspect of identified nodes of growth, I'm wondering that's the assumption that all of the focused areas are considered those nodes or is this in reference to what we pick up and move forward as the identified nodes?

LEE: I think it's, the action plan, is really a short year, three to five year what can we do, so in a subset of areas FPIAs, if we go that direction it would be nice to identify some specific things and a limited number of those that we could do to try and fast start job creation efforts that we would like to see succeed in those areas.

ORJIAKO: I will only add also that when we presented this to the Board there was some concern on Page 3, Item g. I'm not sure whether the issue on B and O tax is one that the County will consider, but we put this in here as some investigative tools that could be considered. Some of them may require some new State legislation, but it is included in here revenue sharing, revenue pooling, some concept and some ideas that could be explored.

WRISTON: What were they concerned about, County coffers?

ORJIAKO: Well, you know, having a B and O tax for example. It wasn't an objection but there was some indication that the City of Vancouver that has it is thinking about repealing it, you know, those type of issues or why would the County want to have a B and O tax, but these are just a list of investigative tools that could be explored.

WRISTON: I got you.

SMITH: A general question. It appears the Port may be giving up 522 acres of heavy industry area. Is that going to be worked into the comp plan somewhere?

LEE: It actually has little effect on the comp plan. In estimating what the job creation potential from the Port is, we estimated that roughly about 6,000 jobs could be created there given the assumptions of which we only credited 3,000 coming on-line within the next 20 years, so it really did not affect the numbers generated from the Port.

WRISTON: So we don't have to worry about the 546 acres or whatever they just lost?

SMITH: 22.

WRISTON: 22. Oh, that's right, I should have known.

LEE: That is correct, that should not affect the overall job creation estimates we've made so far.

LEIN: We'll pick that up in the rural area, won't we?

LEE: We could pick it up in downtown Vancouver.

WRISTON: There you go. Thanks, Carey.

SMITH: You're welcome.

LEIN: Any other comments on Chapter 12?

BARCA: Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: Going back to some of the focused public investments that we're looking at on Page D-2, we have Item b and Item f as two items that we look like we want to accomplish between year 1 and 5 that appear to have a lot of work ahead of them. Do either of these items that we're looking at, wetland mitigation bank or the aspect of establish a discretionary fund for the County's use in economic development, is there ground work done on either of those items at this time?

LEE: Yes. Specifically when the Board was debating the REET there was a certain amount of money that was split off for economic development this past year, so there is a small increment of REET financing that could be a start of a discretionary fund. Obviously it needs to get a lot bigger, but that's some of the ground work that's been done. And I believe that Commissioner Pridemore has a group of interested folks that's taking a look at wetlands mitigation banking at this point.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Oliver, is there anything that we need to do in looking at Appendix A or Appendix B I mean as far as looking at this? It would be a little awkward on Appendix B because we haven't talked about the urban growth areas for the cities, so I would not imagine that we're adopting that at this time?

ORJIAKO: You are correct. I think that the maps that we included here reflects -- when you get to the UGA reflects pretty much the proposed plan map 2003, so any changes that the PC makes as we go through the individual UGAs, this probably will have to change.

LEE: Realistically a lot of maps are not going to change with the natural resource or --

WRISTON: Critical lands.

LEIN: Critical lands, yeah.

LEE: -- critical lands areas that are in the existing GIS database. Certainly the land use and the travel demand forecast will ultimately be changed.

LEIN: I think it's just the urban growth areas that might be subject to change, everything else would --

LEE: Right.

ORJIAKO: Yes, everything else would remain the same.

LEIN: And then Appendix C is just statutes and codes.

ORJIAKO: Right.

LEIN: Rich, the Growth Management Act Amendments between '95 and 2002, is there anything significant in there that you haven't already covered with us?

LOWRY: Actually the majority of these we got into through one remand or another. I don't see anything in here that is significantly new to this exercise.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Would you like to see some action on this before we go on to the --

LEE: Yes. And I suppose procedurally how we go about it, recognizing we might have to come back and make a few changes maybe we do kind of a straw vote and then before making final recommendation solidify things. Does that sound like a reasonable approach? And perhaps that's how we could go through the Code Amendments as well as we get into those.

LEIN: Okay. Anybody want to come forward with any comments?

WRISTON: Well, yeah, I got a, you know, a couple of things that I'm just going to throw out, and I'm not opening it up for, if we want to talk about it we can talk about it, but I want to throw it out because we had a significant amount of testimony on it and we didn't have a whole lot of testimony on the specific to the comprehensive plan text issues themselves and the methodology issues, I mean on the urban growth boundaries and all we had some, but going back and looking at my notes we had a fair amount of testimony on, you know, the market factor, the infrastructure deduction, the conversion factors, things like that, part of which relates to the, you know, a lot of which relates to the vacant buildable lands analysis and I guess from my standpoint I just want to throw out for the record and anyone else who wants to throw out for the record can do so as well, but from where I come from on those issues, I still believe that from a residential standpoint we should have a market factor.

We heard a lot of testimony, I think it was 25 percent in the past and now it's just gone and we heard a lot of testimony that the development community has stepped forward and said, you know, 25 percent, they didn't say 25 percent may be high, I think what we heard anywhere from 10 to 15 percent I believe and I would still encourage the Commissioners and for what it's worth. And I know they've already pretty much made up their minds and adopted the policy, but that we shouldn't prejudiced residential. I know they think they've made it up in their tweak of the population numbers and some other factors, but I don't believe we've made it up enough to where we should be prejudicing the residential when

we have it for commercial and industrial. And so in terms of a market factor I would urge that the Commissioners look at adopting a market factor for residential, although I would say that 25 percent is probably high, but maybe 10 percent or 12 percent or whatever they think. But residential still plays a part, whether we like it or not residential plays an important, a very important role in what we're trying to accomplish in the county in terms of affordable housing and executive housing and all those things that go part and parcel with the economic growth. And it's a balance I admit, but it does play a role.

From the infrastructure deduction standpoint, we went from I think 38 percent to 27.5 percent, is that right, and I've been having a (inaudible) because I think 38 percent is probably high, but I think 27.5 percent is probably low from what I've seen and what I've experienced. But I will throw that out that, that was an issue. And I think 27.5 percent is low, but I'm not as worried about that as I am -- I'm not as concerned with that as I am with the market factor, but I still think it's more than 27.5 percent, but it's probably not a huge significance.

And then there was the 70 percent conversion factor for the underutilized land which we heard testimony that it should be somewhere between 30 to 50 percent and I think the testimony, I just wrote these notes, and because it makes sense was that it was, you know, compensate for the prevalence of large lots, you know, that may or may not get developed, you know, that whole, that whole aspect out there again that goes with the vacant buildable lands analysis and I would encourage looking at that again as well. I mean I think that that -- I don't have a magic number, but I think that it bears looking into or at least something we ought to bear in mind.

And then lastly the two other things that, you know, that we're going to talk about urban holding tonight and I'm going to try to encourage the Commission that we don't go into that in detail tonight because I think that bears, I think that's a very important issue and I think it bears having I think a fuller quorum and I know Ron's leaving at 9:00 and it's a very important issue so I'm going to encourage the -- maybe we can talk about it, but there's the urban holding issue, there's the capital facilities issue, which I don't know whether we're supposed to be talking about that tonight or not, but we do have a capital facilities of that. But it was suggested that by testimony and also with some, you know, discussion I think there's been a suggestion that perhaps we move this forward but we don't, but we encourage the Commissioners not to pass this until we have a supportable capital facilities plan which goes part and parcel with the urban holding. I mean that's -- urban holding I guess is the Band-Aid if we don't do it the other way.

And then there were a couple other things that I had in my notes that I'm not sure where they go in and that's why I'll bring them up. We had the question about not applying in-fill to areas of expansion and I don't know whether that goes here or whether it goes somewhere else.

LEE: We'll be discussing that as part of the codes in the in-fill amendment.

WRISTON: The code --

LEE: It's one of the code --

WRISTON: -- changes here?

LEE: -- changes that we'll be talking about, yeah.

WRISTON: Okay. And that's another biggie. I mean that's another fairly --

LEE: We can talk about that.

WRISTON: -- meaty subject that we need to discuss. And then I wrote down mixed use zone and you guys got to, all got to help me.

LEE: That's also we were hoping to discuss that tonight. And actually we have come through with some potential revisions to the mixed use zone that we want to discuss with the Planning Commission.

WRISTON: And I saw that and I'm assuming my notes were related to that. I think there was just a lot of discussion that we have a mixed use zone that doesn't work I think was a lot of the testimony. So I want to throw all that out. I'm not necessarily saying we need to discuss it, but from my standpoint some of those issues we got a lot of testimony on it and I think we should at least -- I guess what I'm doing is acknowledging it and saying where I come from on those issues.

LEIN: Good.

WRISTON: Good.

BARCA: Good.

WRISTON: So.

LEIN: Ron.

BARCA: Well, from the standpoint of having been previewed in the capital facilities plan and understanding the cost factor of any expansion, I think the conservative approach on all of this would be to try and do what we can to accept the demonstrated numbers and limit expansion where it's possible in that regard. If we can show an infrastructure number that looks like 27 or 28 percent, it's a place to start.

From the standpoint of market factor, I think the only reason there's a market factor in commercial and industrial lands is in the aspect that there was a desire to try and have a plentiful inventory always available to snatch out from the Portland side any potential clients that would need such lands available, I don't believe it's from the standpoint that market factor is necessary in industrial or commercial either. If we're always going to be in

the aspect of saying that we have to have a supply that meets a long-term goal and that we'll be reviewing this in a 5 or 10-year time frame, the 20 year horizon will never be tapped out so all that happens with market factor is you put additional lands on the market early. I think what I did see, though, and what we had a discussion about is the aspect of some of the numbers that we've been able to ground truth look like higher redevelopment numbers in the forms of jobs and I believe that it would be prudent on our part to put those numbers in place and then to monitor them over the 5-year period that we're going to go through after we adopt this and see if those numbers really do pan out the way that we think that they are going to; otherwise we would be in a position of needing to expand.

But just from fiscal conservancy I would think that we would look at any of these particular assumptions that we're working towards and saying that if we have some data that drives us in a direction, then we have to work with it and if that data comes from the idea of us being able to actually constrain our needs to expand, I think that's the fiscally prudent thing to do and it's the one that makes it easier for us then to really get into the place where we as a group start targeting some of these focused areas. I can't remember that acronym, it's FPIA, Focus Public Investment Areas, yeah. Okay. And maybe there is in the 1 to 5-year time frame only two or three that this body feels it is worth going after, but that that recommendation by it being so finite I think really passes forward some good information to the Board of County Commissioners in that regard as opposed to picking a dozen places that we know we can't really fund and go after. So understanding I believe your request to review the assumptions I would --

WRISTON: No, I'm not requesting that we review the assumptions. I think we're, we got to go forward with the assumptions we have, I'm just throwing out my belief. And I mean the assumptions like market factor and things like that, that was set, the Commissioners set it and we move forward on that and I don't think there's anything we can do to put the brakes on it or we're going to be here forever, right. I'm just throwing it. And I know Pat doesn't want to --

LEE: Well, actually a little different way of looking at it, hopefully on Thursday night we'll begin to go into, you know, more detailed discussion of potential land use map changes and if you want to stay here later tonight we can get into that discussion tonight.

WRISTON: Sure.

LEE: But I think -- I mean I fully expected and have wanted to utilize this whole process all along to tune-up the land use plan that has been proposed and it may be at the end of the day after reviewing the various changes that have been put on the table that whatever you settle on, you know, if you just did a pure statistical analysis like we've done to size boundaries so far, it might vary a little bit and that is why I just want to come back at the end after sort of going through each of these map changes, take a cumulative look and at that time if we're right on target, good; if we're a little bit over on residential, then maybe that's something you pass forward and suggest that become the market factor or whatever.

WRISTON: Yeah, that's a good point.

LEE: So I'd rather work through the process, see where we end up, sort of drop back, take the cumulative look, and then before making final recommendations maybe fine-tune that a little bit based on any interaction among the Planning Commission here.

WRISTON: I think that's a great approach, a really good approach. One concern I'd have with what Ron said, and it would be more of a question I think, if we took Ron's approach in terms of capital facilities, could we expand at all?

LEE: I mean there's any variety of permutations. For the Draft Environmental Impact Statement we had five alternatives, some that had considerable expansion, more than what's in the proposed plan, and some that didn't have any at all. So I think --

WRISTON: No, I know, but I mean from the standpoint of the background that we're getting in terms of the remand versus the invalidity order, you know, the whole parade of horrors, is not expanding even a solution to what we're doing? Because I mean it seems to me like we're behind the eight ball regardless of what we do.

LOWRY: I don't think we know. I mean I don't think that analysis has been done, particularly the 6 year financing analysis hasn't been done and that's where you really have to prove up your ability to afford and until that's done we're not going to know.

WRISTON: So we just don't know. And I guess that's my point in the what's been proposed as a possible solution to it outside of urban holding has been put our best foot forward, but then maybe put it on hold until we see where we stand in capital facilities. I'm not advocating that, and I'm not not advocating it, I don't know where it stands.

LEE: That is the policy option that our legal counsel has suggested both to this body and the Board.

WRISTON: That we hold off on adopting it until we get the capital facilities plan?

LEE: That is certainly a policy option and at this time --

WRISTON: But you're not advocating that, though, or are you?

LEE: I'm not advocating that.

LEIN: That's up to the Planning Commission.

WRISTON: No, I know. But I mean what's your advice?

LOWRY: My advice is to comply with the Act.

WRISTON: Is what?

LOWRY: To comply with the Act means you adopt an integrated internally consistent plan.

WRISTON: Which means we need a capital facilities portion?

LOWRY: Yes. Now there is a lot of policy reasons why it may make sense to adopt a plan that we know is going to get remanded and that's Pat's position.

WRISTON: Okay.

LEE: I concur.

WRISTON: Yeah. No.

LEIN: You notice Rich didn't give his position.

WRISTON: No, I understand. No, I've had enough legal background to recognize that, I see it, and that was good, that was a good answer. Only Evan could have done that better, but you did answer the question. I think so.

LEIN: Carey, Dick, do you have any comments on this?

DELEISSEGUES: I don't.

SMITH: No.

LEIN: Well, I think Jeff has hit on the vast majority of things that I had listed here. The other I think that came up tonight is that potential developing and monitoring program on the industrial, I think that could be something.

WRISTON: I think on the whole, I think it bears when and if we're ever done with this or whenever the time would be appropriate not just on maybe, not even just on the industrial economic but maybe just the whole and it doesn't have to be, you know, analysis paralysis. I mean it would be interesting to see if have a work session or two just on some of what's out there and just kind of brainstorm and bounce around what are some of the key indicators or benchmarks or whatever you want to call them that would be really interesting to look at so that those of us that are here 5 years from now, which is a long time --

BARCA: Still hearing this same comp plan.

WRISTON: -- it would just be really interesting to revisit --

SMITH: We'll still be in remand.

WRISTON: -- and to have some buy-in on those numbers and all.

LEIN: Jeff, from experience it goes fast though.

WRISTON: I know it does. Well, I believe it. I didn't think I'd be here the second or third time. I don't even know what this is now, but it seems like. But anyway, it maybe look at that and maybe we can help you staff bring those, you know, recommend that we bring those down too. I mean because that's what, I mean, you know, in business you get those things too, everyone wants to look at everything, and really when it comes down to it there's only a few that are really meaningful and the rest are just kind of paper that no one really looks at. But what happens is, if you have too many no one looks at anything and, you know.

LEIN: Okay. With that, why don't we take a little break and then we'll come back and discuss Code Changes.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: Okay. We'd like to bring the hearing back to order. We'll continue on with the proposed comprehensive plan update on code changes. Mr. Higbie.

HIGBIE: Thank you. Bob Higbie, Long-Range Planning. We have about four different zones that we'd like to go through with you briefly. As you recall we did go through them a little earlier, a couple of weeks ago, so I'm going to try to keep it brief. The first code change we're suggesting is in Chapter 40.230 of the new code that's being rewritten and considered by the Board. And actually I think it was adopted by consent either last week or this week.

The change we're suggesting to the urban holding district is that creating a new larger lot size of urban holding 40 which would apply to business, business park, office campus and industrial zones. The 40-acre minimum is being recommended based on the economic development community suggesting that job creating the land be retained in these larger lots as possible. That is the only change that we're suggesting that's reflected in appropriate places through the urban holding zone.

BARCA: Bob, in that regard then, the urban holding 40 for the sake of a business park type accommodations is still utilized in an urban growth boundary scenario, it isn't one of these situations where it's created as an island outside of an urban growth boundary?

HIGBIE: The only place the urban holding is appropriate to apply is within urban growth boundaries. In 1994 when the comprehensive plan was adopted, then all of the land was -- I don't want to say all but all that I know of in any of the expanded urban growth boundaries outside of the city of Vancouver were all included in an urban holding zone. That's the way the small Cities want it because they have not extended sewer and water type uses into those lands and as a result they want urban development to wait until it's annexed. And subsequent to 1994 a lot of the smaller Cities did in fact annex a lot of those lands and they're being developed now.

BARCA: But once they are annexed, the aspect of them being developed into industrial parks, office campus or office style campuses, that's somewhat subjective to the whim of the individual municipality?

HIGBIE: Correct. At this point, to my knowledge Clark County is the only jurisdiction that has a no net loss policy for industrial land. The City of Vancouver is expecting to adopt one.

LOWRY: Just a little footnote on that. It's not entirely, Rich Lowry again, not entirely simply at the whim of the City. In order for them to change designations, they would have to amend their comprehensive plans which would then be subject to review by the Hearings Board and if those amendments meant, for example, that they had an over-supply of residential property, then that kind of a challenge would likely be successful.

BARCA: Okay. I was actually thinking more in the context of supply of land made available for the aspect of big box commercial when it had been designated as office park or industrial lands initially. Under those circumstances I guess, of course, it would still be whether it would hold up as a comp plan change, but it wouldn't be a residential matter as much as adding additional commercial property to their portfolio?

LOWRY: Right. The no net loss policy that the County has doesn't designate whether it can be used for big box or major employer, it's just generically industrial now and potentially business park also, so that risk also applies under the County's plan.

BARCA: That's not good.

WRISTON: So what you just said, I may be stating the obvious, but what you just said, this whole urban holding concept could add an additional layer of review? I mean every, I mean, or am I taking that too far? I mean if we adopted this urban holding concept, and I know that's not exactly what you were, but if we adopted this concept and brought a lot of these lands within urban holding, then the City of Vancouver or whoever it is, whatever City wants to take them out of urban holding, that subjects it to another potential layer of review through the Hearings Board or not?

LOWRY: Not the annexation but the --

WRISTON: The rezone or the change in comp?

LOWRY: Well, the Cities will all have to adopt comprehensive plans for their own cities. Those plans have to be consistent with the County's plan, including the vacant buildable lands analysis that went into sizing the UGAs.

WRISTON: But when we, when they go up under this scenario, and maybe I'm probably going into something that we haven't started into yet, but under this urban holding scenario if it's under the annexation or the subarea, either one of those or any of these scenarios where that urban holding would change to another zone, an urban zoning or whatever, some other zone, is that subject to a GMA challenge? In other words are we just we do it

now, it's subject to challenge and then when later when it's changed, it's subject to challenge again theoretically?

LOWRY: Yes. And also when the Cities adopt --

WRISTON: Annex?

LOWRY: Not from the annex, that's not -- the Growth Boards don't have jurisdiction to review annexations, but the Cities will have to adopt plans for these new areas.

WRISTON: One at a time though? I mean if it's brought in one at a time they would have to I guess theoretically they would, wouldn't they?

LOWRY: Well, no, they will have to adopt a plan for their entire new UGA expanded areas and that plan if it's not consistent with the County's plan is challengeable on that ground.

LEIN: Rich, can I run sort of a scenario by you. Say you have urban holding, it's zoned business park, okay, and that piece they come back and say they have all the utilities, all the infrastructure, transportation, et cetera, and they want to do a development and it's over 40 acres, could it develop without further action or could they just come in and prove that they have that without going through any annexation?

LOWRY: It depends. For the traditional rule, as Bob indicated for the smaller cities is the County doesn't provide urban services around those smaller cities if they have to annex before they can develop. That was the general rule in '94 and I haven't heard anything from the Board suggesting that that general rule wouldn't continue.

HIGBIE: Nor have you heard anything different from the Cities.

LOWRY: No, that all the Cities, the smaller Cities want --

WRISTON: It's a different scenario though. I mean it's work and it's --

LOWRY: Right. The complexity is really with the city of Vancouver because there's historically been a huge amount of urban unincorporated development around the city of Vancouver.

WRISTON: And different service providers?

LOWRY: And different service providers.

WRISTON: Right. I mean that's the --

LOWRY: So the --

LEIN: So the answer is, no, they could not develop?

LOWRY: Around the small cities the County would, we would do as we did in 1994, would adopt urban holding around the smaller cities, the smaller Cities would adopt their own comp plans. And they even have the authority to grant zoning before it's annexed so there's predictability upon annexation.

WRISTON: But the answer is, I mean -- well, in Vancouver the answer would be no unless it was annexed, subarea planned or incorporated into a new city?

LOWRY: Under this proposal.

WRISTON: Under this proposal, right. Right. Right. Right. Right.

LOWRY: Yes. And that is a change in policy from 1994.

WRISTON: Right.

BARCA: So for me to understand what Vaughn's question originally was compared to the answer that you gave, Jeff, suppose we're dealing with a municipality other than Vancouver. When Vaughn stated that utilities were present, we would be talking about --

LEIN: It could be.

HIGBIE: The general rule is and the Cities in 100 percent of the cases required annexation except for the City of Vancouver prior to any development, but all of the urban holding districts for -- or all the urban holding policies that we've got for all of those cities have a way where if the City said, no, go ahead, if you really want to develop that area because of the unique nature of whatever the development might be and we don't necessarily want it to be annexed, there is a provision that would allow for that.

BARCA: Which is the subarea plan method?

WRISTON: No.

HIGBIE: Yes, basically. Yes.

WRISTON: Well, basically what is it?

HIGBIE: Well, you've got it in your September 10 handout.

WRISTON: I got it right here.

HIGBIE: In the case of Camas it talks about "if annexation is not geographically feasible, adoption of an interlocal agreement and subarea plan to the extent feasible to Clark County and the City of Camas that includes the following" and then --

LEIN: Bob, could you direct us to where you're at?

HIGBIE: I'm on Tab 1. That would be Page 5, Exhibit 1A.

WRISTON: This is "DRAFT Urban Holding Language"?

HIGBIE: Yes, that's correct.

WRISTON: This is what's being proposed?

HIGBIE: Yes.

LOWRY: Yeah, it is. As I recall the '94 plan didn't talk about subarea planning being done with the small cities, it just talked about an interlocal agreement and in practical effect the smaller cities have the ability to veto urban development before annexation simply by not providing sewer or water.

HIGBIE: The current language in the current comprehensive plan is most accurately reflected in on Page 3 of that Exhibit 1A for La Center and it talks about the interlocal, intergovernmental agreement, the provision of urban services, and an assurance from the City that public services will be provided in conjunction with development.

WRISTON: Right. And they're all over the -- each of the Cities a bit of a different approach but --

LEIN: Does business park get classified as industrial land?

HIGBIE: That's our proposal.

LEE: Well, actually for -- it's actually we are proposing a new comp plan designation of employment district which is implemented through the business park and office campus zoning districts, but we would propose to extend the no net loss policy to those lands in addition to the industrially designated lands.

BARCA: Business park is not allowed in our industrial land bank scenario if I recall correctly.

LEE: The industrial land bank legislation, I don't know how narrowly they define industrial. It could be that some of the types of developments that fit within the business park district would fit in an industrial land bank.

BARCA: I think the prohibition is pretty specific.

LOWRY: Commercial but --

BARCA: I think it says business park or office park, something of that nature so.

LOWRY: I'll look it up.

BARCA: Yeah, please look it up, but I am pretty sure. Based on the testimony that we got last week I took some time and looked it up and was able to satisfy myself and forget what I learned, but Rich will remind me here in a moment. And while we're waiting for that, the aspect of the 219th interchange, at one point in time we had talked about or moved towards the idea of trying to subarea plan around the interchange and I believe, Evan, you were heading up some action in that regard. Did we ever create a mechanism for doing just that?

LEE: Actually, no. What happened it was reviewed by the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission made their recommendation to the Board, the Board tabled it and suggested that we integrate the policies as part of the comp plan effort.

BARCA: And are we doing that?

LEE: That is our intent to do that. The current versions of the comp plan text do not include that language, but we would be proposing to integrate it as it moves on to the Board.

DUST: For the record, Evan Dust. What Pat said is correct. Particularly in the Planning Commission discussion of the interchange location policy or interchange protection policy, the Planning Commission raised several key policy issues that we are trying to seek clarification on from the Board as to the Board's desire as to how that policy will be shaped. In particular my recollection is the Planning Commission raised enough questions that you did not get to a formal recommendation to the Board but you transmitted your record of deliberations.

BARCA: I think that region now has raised itself in significance to the point that I would feel us negligent if we didn't do something on that property and just allowed it to continue to go the course of its current zoning, so I guess I would like to see the Planning Commission formally ask that we finish the language of that and get it into this comp plan review that we're working on right now. How do you guys feel about that?

HIGBIE: Are you speaking of the zoning around the proposed new interchange, most of which is large lot rural or agriculture?

WRISTON: And we heard testimony to that; right?

BARCA: We did hear testimony to that.

WRISTON: So that goes to that whole issue that we've asked clear written direction be read into the record from the County Commissioners; right? Doesn't that go, I mean that's

--

HIGBIE: There was at least one site-specific request if that's what you're referring to.

WRISTON: Yeah, there was at least one. I know there was at least one.

LEE: There was actually about three or four.

LEIN: But they were all on the west side of the freeway.

LEE: Yes. And then there was also testimony from one or two individuals that had received notice of the WSDOT design plans and were questioning what happens west of I-5. Actually they clearly wanted a firm decision --

WRISTON: They have a good point.

LEE: -- never to extend west of I-5.

WRISTON: Yeah. They're saying, you know, in this planning horizon this interchange is going to be built and we're not going to be ready to take it, you know, do anything, take advantage of it isn't the right word, but do anything, you know, we're not going to be properly zoned for that, for that use, I think was the testimony. And basically anyway, wasn't it?

LEE: There was -- I mean there was, you know, two divergent viewpoints. There was some that were looking to capture some of the commuter commercial --

WRISTON: Right.

LEE: -- and then there were some that wanted to draw a line in the sand to make sure there wasn't extension of 219th west --

WRISTON: Correct.

LEE: -- and to the south.

WRISTON: That's right. Yeah. Okay. I think we got to wait until that's outside the urban growth boundary and site-specific rural, isn't it?

BARCA: Well, before Rich comes in and changes the subject again I guess I'd just put it back out on the record that I think the 219th interchange is too important of a event that's on the horizon to ignore the fact that it's coming there and if this is part of our growth plan for transportation, then the interchange itself should be viewed as a valuable commodity to be maximized for economic potential and if we don't take the time to have the right language in place that allows us to plan around that future interchange, we're going to wish we had.

LEE: Let me elaborate a little bit not to belabor this point but since you raised it. Actually the recommendations came from the I-5 Trade Corridor study and there is a variety of recommendations that are being built into a land use accord among jurisdictions along the I-5 corridor that include the greater coordination on economic and land use issues, specifically calling for stationary planning around high capacity transit stations, where they're located, the interchange location policy, transportation demand management strategies and transportation system management strategies and they have a whole long list of potential strategies that are addressed through this by reference through this land use accord. In the I-5 Trade Corridor when they begin land use accord at one time, and I believe it's currently the status is that the extent of the effect on intersections ended at 179th Street instead of going all the way up to the Clark County boundary on the north. So current status is it only applies up to 179th Street.

Now I understand that is going to be revisited through continuing discussions on this land use accord process, but that is the current status. And actually the interchange location policy was not specific to 219th, certainly 219th raised that, but anywhere where there's going to be a major investment at an intersection new or totally reconstructing, basically which would include areas along I-5 as well as along I-205, that is where the policy was to be directed. So that's kind of a more complete story of the status and the scope of that particular policy.

BARCA: Does that change what I said?

LEE: No. But before begging the question I wanted the other Planning Commissioners to be aware of the current status.

BARCA: Okay. Feel free to chime in any time you guys want to.

DELEISSEGUES: We're waiting for the answer from Rich.

WRISTON: You're doing great, it's a filibuster.

LOWRY: Ron is 90 percent right, the definition of "major industrial development" the statute says "means a master plan location suitable for manufacturing or industrial businesses," and then it goes on to say "the major industrial development may not be for the purpose of retail, commercial development or multi-tenant office parks." So if you -- if it was a single tenant office park, this sort of suggests that it could fit.

BARCA: So we can move a Microsoft style business into there but we couldn't do an Eastridge.

LEE: Do Boeing.

BARCA: Boeing's too small. They're not what they used to be.

WRISTON: Oh, gees. I hope no one's watching.

BARCA: Don't worry. Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Anything else on the urban holding right now? I know that we're going to continue that discussion as we get further deliberations with the whole Commission.

WRISTON: Yeah. I, no, I think it's important enough that we should when we have, when we have a fuller night which hopefully Thursday we will. But you haven't received any -- it was my understanding that there was some additional proposed mitigating language floating out there and I don't see it in this new, so I must assume that you don't have that?

LEE: That is the latest transmittal we have.

WRISTON: And what's changed in what you gave us versus what --

LEE: Nothing.

WRISTON: Okay. It's just another copy?

LEE: Yeah. We gave you that last week.

WRISTON: October 16th; right?

LEE: Correct.

WRISTON: And it's just another copy that we have tonight, okay. So nothing's changed. Okay.

HIGBIE: Well, it would be nice if you could consider making a recommendation on the district itself since the only thing that we're suggesting in the district itself is 40-acre minimum lot size to be added.

WRISTON: Why would that be nice?

HIGBIE: Well, it would get one thing out of the way.

BARCA: Our first one tonight.

HIGBIE: But if you don't want to, that's fine.

WRISTON: No.

HIGBIE: Then the next thing on the agenda is mixed use. There was a number of people that testified on the draft mixed use code and we asked if -- based on all that testimony we asked a private consultant to take a look at the code and make some suggestions on it to make it workable, and based on those comments we made a number of changes which we

gave you in the Draft 3 of the mixed use zone a week or so ago. And we are also taking another look, kind of stepping back a bit, at the amount of mixed use land use that we've designated on the comprehensive plan. And so when we get to that to the actual maps I think you'll see that the amount of mixed use that we're recommending be placed on the comprehensive plan map has been reduced rather by quite a bit, so that will solve at least one of the problems because they'll be recommended for zoning in more traditional zoning districts.

We are doing a couple of things that are a little bit different. The current mixed use designation allows for a whole variety of different zones to be allowed within it and as a result of that there's been very little actual MX or mixed use zoning applied to the land, the landscape, so we're recommending for the new areas, the newly expanded areas where the mixed use designation would be applied, that the only zone allowed within the mixed use plan designation is the mixed use zoning district and therefore that will assure that we will actually get some mixed use development which we've been getting very little of under the current scenario.

Within the current urban growth boundaries where we have a mixed use plan designation but we have a variety of zoning districts already applied, we're suggesting that we leave that alone and provide a statement in the comprehensive plan that would designate or make it clear that in the current urban growth boundaries that zoning of commercial or industrial or whatever it might be in the current mixed use plan designation could develop as is under those zones; however, if they wanted to request a rezone from commercial or residential to something else, the only appropriate zone at that time would be mixed use. So the current zoning would not change unless the Board authorized us to go back and take a specific look at those areas sometime in the future.

The mixed use zone itself I've made -- based on those comments with the consultant made some changes. Basically their biggest concern with the mixed use as it was originally proposed is that it was a zone that you would more appropriately find in more urban areas such as downtown Portland and they didn't feel that in a suburban environment the mixed use zone as proposed would have worked very well, and so what you'll see through Draft 3 is making it a more suburban type zone, reducing the kinds of criteria that would be required, making it easier to develop under the standards because they're more flexible and provide for more suburban type standards. So with that I'll just go briefly through some of the major changes that we've suggested.

First, that currently the code would allow going up to 42 units of residential per acre, we're suggesting that we only allow medium density up to a medium density residential which is 22 units per acre. Because we have no experience with the code itself, we're suggesting that the planned unit development ordinance not apply to this chapter and we provide a language to that effect. We've changed the percentages somewhat so that a minimum of 20 percent of the development area would need to be nonresidential and a minimum of 30 percent of the development must be residential so there would be a slight emphasis on residential as opposed to commercial. Under the original draft there was a 30 percent minimum for any particular land use, this would change that slightly to allow slightly more

commercial, excuse me, slightly more residential and slightly less commercial would have to be required in that zone. We increased the lot size from 5,000-square feet to one acre where you could be exempt from the requirements of the mixed use zone itself. You could develop residential uses if you had a preexisting lot that's under one acre with no required mix of uses.

On Page 2 we need to delete 1.b, I missed that on the last update because it allows for high density development as opposed to medium density. All of the uses remain the same. All of these uses were reflective of the old C-3 zone, well, the C-3 zone, and they were incorporated into the mixed use zone itself. On Page 5 we're talking about the floor area ratio. Under the existing code it is you need to have a minimum of 5, .5-square feet of floor area per one square foot of gross area and we're suggesting reducing that to .3-square feet which will allow less of the lot to be built upon making it easier to develop in a more suburban environment. And where you have a residential minimum lot size of 12 units per acre, gross acre, that is required, if you have minimum average, you can have a minimum average density of 10 units per gross area in -- on preexisting lots of ones of an acre or less. Item 3, b.(3) also needs to be changed to from 43 to 22 to reflect the medium density maximum. On Page 6 the current minimum --

BARCA: Wait a minute, Bob.

SMITH: Wait a minute. Isn't that from 30 to 43?

HIGBIE: No, it's from 43 to 22. We are recommending that it be a medium density zoning for residential so we're suggesting take it down from 30 or 43 down to 22, a maximum of 22 units per acre.

BARCA: So Page 5, Section E.b, 1.b, excuse me.

HIGBIE: (3).

BARCA: Item (3) says "the maximum average density shall be an average of 43."

HIGBIE: Yes, and I'm saying that should be changed to 22.

SMITH: Oh, okay.

WRISTON: Oh, it's not here.

HIGBIE: No, I'm asking you to make that change.

LEIN: No, making the change tonight.

WRISTON: 22. But the minimum average density is -- so you're still encouraging high, medium density development?

HIGBIE: Between 12 and 22 units per acre.

WRISTON: And you're banning --

HIGBIE: High density.

WRISTON: And low?

HIGBIE: And low.

WRISTON: So no single-family?

HIGBIE: Well, I believe that you could get single-family.

WRISTON: You could if you averaged your densities?

HIGBIE: You'd have to average it.

BARCA: And why is it that our policy is to ban the high end?

WRISTON: High density.

BARCA: High density.

HIGBIE: Well, the argument for this zone itself to change it to be suburban in nature suggests that the residential density shouldn't be the kind of densities that you would see in a more urban environment like downtown Vancouver, so we're carrying through on that and suggesting that the density should be -- should not be as intense as they are in a more urban environment.

WRISTON: But you could do a single -- theoretically you could do a single-family 6,000-square foot lot and then an apartment building --

HIGBIE: Sure.

WRISTON: -- and average your densities that way?

HIGBIE: Sure.

WRISTON: I have to kind of think about all of them, you know, but that's --

BARCA: It seems to me if we give a range, what is the fear if a developer feels that they can make a go of it at the high density other than the fact that we created a policy that said we don't want to be high end, high density urban? Why would we preclude somebody from doing that if they feel it's viable in the marketplace to do that, especially if we end up in a situation where it's a large mixed use development whether it be something in the

neighborhood of like a Fairview Village or something comparable to that that would include large retail, small main street style shops with housing above it?

WRISTON: The same argument goes for single family though.

BARCA: Well, you set a high and you set a low, I guess all I'm saying is why is the high set at medium rather than allow it to go high?

WRISTON: But the low's not set at low either. I mean I guess the same argument goes though.

LEE: I think what argument Ron is arguing is that maybe we change the ordinance to allow both ends. Is that what you're suggesting, both the lower density, the medium density and the high density?

BARCA: Well, I think within the context of mixed use we need to get to some level of density that makes it reasonable to say that this is the public policy going in to that, and if we're going to try and count a certain amount of population growth within this commercial district, you need to have a minimum that helps us get to R-8 housing units per acre average that we say that we're going forward with, that would be my primary argument of why you wouldn't go to a low density single-family environment.

WRISTON: To get to the 8 though.

BARCA: To get to the 8.

WRISTON: 8 per --

BARCA: Yeah. And if we have --

WRISTON: -- which pushes you out beyond, well beyond 8 though, the effect of it does.

BARCA: Well, of course it does. But I'm --

SMITH: The average.

BARCA: Yeah. I'm back to the aspect that says that I see some examples that appear in a suburban setting in the metro area that clearly are at the high end of density and the policy that states we want it to look suburban for mixed use might make sense today, but this is a 20 year growth plan and what's it going to look like in the future where we wish that we had gone higher density because the market would have allowed it. Oh, gosh, look at the time. And on that note --

LEE: And if the Planning Commission wants we could revise it to provide for both medium density and a higher density as being permitted to cover a wider range. I mean the feedback that we got was that it certainly hasn't to date been used very much and, you

know, we're trying to respond to our queries of what, well, what do you think the key provisions of the ordinance are that are prohibiting its more widespread use. We want to use the -- we want an ordinance that is used and if we can do that by providing a wider range, then I guess we can do that.

LEIN: Does it meet some of the goals we're after there in terms of reduction of number of automobile trips? Not if we have a high density it doesn't.

HIGBIE: It may but --

LEE: It depends where they're going.

LEIN: If they're going locally you mean?

LEE: Yeah.

LEIN: It would reduce it because it would be on-site, okay.

WRISTON: Well, the type of densities we're talking about, yeah, I mean I guess in theory they would be on-site, but, yeah, that's a reach, that's a stretch, but I guess I'm envisioning maybe larger.

LEE: Gees, we get that argument all the time.

WRISTON: I'm sure.

HIGBIE: What is the desire of the Commission?

WRISTON: To as far as what?

HIGBIE: As far as density.

WRISTON: I don't know. We'll talk about it next week. Well, I mean I think the same argument can be made for, and I understand the policy considerations and Ron doesn't dare leave, you know, I'll make a pitch for the lower density here, but let's wait until Ron leaves.

BARCA: Oh, just go ahead and vote.

WRISTON: No.

LEIN: No, we won't be voting.

(Commissioner Barca left the hearing.)

HIGBIE: All right. On Page 6 then --

WRISTON: Oh, let's vote.

HIGBIE: -- in the chart on 40.230.020-3 there's a minimum setbacks column of that's where 10 foot has been crossed out and 20 foot has been added back in to make it to increase the setbacks of the front, side and rear yard. I'd like to suggest that my change there not be taken and that we leave it at 10 feet.

LEIN: If you're going to get better density I would agree.

HIGBIE: Down on the --

LEIN: Excuse me, Bob, are you going to leave the setback from the street frontage at 35?

HIGBIE: Yes.

LEIN: What's the point there if I can ask?

HIGBIE: Well, it was 20 to 35 and I just -- basically what I'm doing is eliminating the 20 to give an extra 15 feet.

LEIN: Okay. But my question is why do you want that much setback from the street frontage? You're encouraging higher density.

HIGBIE: To provide the additional flexibility. Right now in most of the zoning districts we have a minimum setback, we don't have a maximum, so that setting it at a --

WRISTON: Oh, that's the furthest you can be?

HIGBIE: Correct. So you couldn't build a Costco 200 feet back, you have to bring it up to 35 feet from the right-of-way.

WRISTON: And that provides flexibility how?

HIGBIE: Well, the current code says 20 to 35 feet.

WRISTON: Maximum?

HIGBIE: Maximum. I'm suggesting you get rid of the 20 so it stays at so you have a maximum of 35 feet to bring it closer to the road than you might otherwise get but still not bring it all the way up 20 feet. The idea is to be pedestrian friendly, orient the development towards the streets.

WRISTON: Yeah, I know.

LEIN: It wouldn't preclude you from being 20 feet from the street?

HIGBIE: Actually my recommendation to get rid of the 20 would mean you could get up to 10 feet from the street.

WRISTON: Well, if I'm looking here I just -- you just keep giving -- I mean this is --

HIGBIE: That's the kind of guy I am.

WRISTON: I know. If I look, you know, if I have a blank stare there's no end to your giving so I'm just --

HIGBIE: There is under the current code a provision to cap the amount of maximum amount of off-street parking that you can provide at 125 percent and I'm suggesting that that be deleted.

LEIN: At the very bottom of that page.

HIGBIE: Yes.

LEE: The bottom of Page, of Number 5 at the bottom of Page 6.

HIGBIE: It's already deleted in your copy.

WRISTON: Where?

HIGBIE: At the very bottom of Page 6.

LEIN: Item Number 5.

WRISTON: I had switched over to the older one.

LEE: He's still giving.

WRISTON: Yeah, I know. No, I had switched over to the older one, okay.

HIGBIE: On Page 7 towards the -- no, it's Number 11 about most of the way down the page, there's some requirements for limiting the amount of parking that you can have in the front of the building, there's a 25 percent of the distance to the property line, et cetera, that can be dedicated to public streets, if they are facing a dedicated street that can be dedicated to parking, and I'm suggesting that be eliminated so under the theory that if you're parked within 35 feet of the front right-of-way, you're probably not going to have a lot of parking in the front yard anyway.

WRISTON: That's a good theory. A tall, skinny structure.

HIGBIE: And the last change that you might be interested in, well, no, not the last one, on

Page 9 on G.2 requiring a neighborhood meeting, it is suggested that it be added for when you're master planning which is a development that would occur that's larger than 5 acres, if it's less than 5 acres master planning is not a requirement, therefore the neighborhood meeting would not be required.

WRISTON: Why are we requiring that?

HIGBIE: Because it is -- it would be a significant size of development requiring a public hearing process and because it's mixed use, the neighborhood would be relatively uncertain as to what was occurring and bringing them into the process early would probably be a good thing for the project and the neighbors.

LEIN: But I could build one 200,000-square foot building and not have to go through master planning?

HIGBIE: Under 5 acres -- any development under 5 acres doesn't have to go through master planning.

WRISTON: And any over has to?

HIGBIE: Yes.

LEIN: No. No, because it says "with two or more building pads."

HIGBIE: Correct.

WRISTON: We're starting to see that. We saw that in the in-fill ordinance and here.

HIGBIE: Yes. Right.

WRISTON: Are we seeing it anywhere else?

LOWRY: Cell towers.

HIGBIE: Cell towers.

WRISTON: Cell towers. I mean I just wrote out for discussion and maybe again next week discuss it but I think it's a good, I think it's a good concept but as a requirement from the County you start to lose, my concern would be you start to lose -- I mean we do, for instance we do -- a lot of times we won't even submit an application until we've had a neighborhood meeting and talked with the neighbors and then we work with them and then we talk to them, and then before we even submit, you know, we tell them now we're going to submit the application, we've got your input, blah, blah, blah, if that's a requirement, you kind of lose the impact of it. They think, well, you're not necessarily a good neighbor, you're just doing that because it's a requirement and then they begin to think that they've got leverage.

I mean, I don't, I throw that, I don't know how I feel about it, but it seems like we're starting to get a trend where we're requiring these neighborhood meetings on top of pre-application conferences and everything else and I think that it can eat into the effectiveness of those of us that are trying to work with neighbors, though looking at cost benefit I'm not sure that those people that don't want to work with neighbors I'm not sure how effective it is. And we heard a lot of testimony on that, on the in-fill, there was a lot of people that it's not that they don't want to work with neighbors, but they just weren't comfortable with it, they didn't know how they'd do it, they didn't know the logistics. I mean there's --

HIGBIE: The little experience we do have with the in-fill neighborhood meetings has been from -- at least the reports that I've heard were from the neighborhood leaders themselves and they felt that the first one or two meetings were shaky because the, and not because the developers didn't know what they were doing but because the neighbors that showed up didn't know quite what to expect and after they worked through a couple of those their opinion is that it's working rather well.

WRISTON: The neighbors' opinions?

HIGBIE: The neighbors. I haven't heard anything from the development side.

WRISTON: Well, I don't know. I don't know how I stand on that, I just want to chew on that a little bit, but it is something that's, you know, it's one more layer, it's one more requirement. It's, you know, and it becomes, it empowers the neighbors. And I'm not saying that's a good or bad thing, but it, and it takes away from the kit that other -- that people may use to differentiate themselves. I understand why the County would want that, but in terms of effectiveness it could, I don't know, it could detract. I'm not sure how, it's just we're seeing more and more of this and I could see if it's, you know, you put it in this ordinance, pretty soon I feel like we're going to start to see it in almost every ordinance we have. I don't know why we wouldn't.

LEE: And there's also a trend to go away from Type III's and more towards Type II's and Type I's which is cutting down on the public review process.

WRISTON: If we can go from Type III's to Type II's and Type I's with neighborhood meetings as a requirement, you got my vote. I mean if that's what, you know, proactive neighborhood work meetings, things like that, if that takes us out of a Type III into a Type II or, you know, some system like that to show that you've done everything you can, worked with the neighbors and things like that, if there's a way to do that, I think that's great, but just throwing out I don't see that here, I still see it as being a Type III. So anyway, I just -- we can talk about that. I don't know where I stand on that, I'm just throwing it out.

HIGBIE: That's it for the changes to the draft, to Draft 3, all the other ones are you've seen before.

LEIN: Bob, I've got a question on Page 10. When I look at the top of the page Item (3),

conceptual plans for potential future uses, and then I go down to h.(1), you've eliminated "conceptual" and said "detail." Now if they go through all the information that's required in Item (3) components of a master development plan, you're going to have --

HIGBIE: You can't have, you can't have it both ways, you're right. So I would say get -- on h.(1) draw a line through "detailed" and put back "conceptual."

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

LEE: Wait, wait, wait, wait. I think the point he's getting at when a required pre-application meeting is, not that you have to submit a conceptual plan, then you have to submit a detailed plan, but before you submit a detailed plan you need to have a pre-application meeting.

LEIN: Something needs to be changed a little bit there to make it a little clearer in my mind.

LEE: Let us consult with the Development Services folks to investigate the distinction between the "conceptual" and the "detailed" that's characterized here.

LEIN: Either that or define differently the components of a master development plan. Thank you. Any other questions of Mr. Higbie on this portion?

LEE: Just to try and recognizing you're not voting but to get a sense of where you are, the things that I heard was I think there still wasn't clear direction on whether or not to allow medium density and high density residential. I think there was again something be further (inaudible) the benefits or detriments of a neighborhood meeting for a Type III and then the issue of a detailed versus conceptual plan. Other than that was there anything that flagged the Commissions' attention as needing a hard look?

LEIN: I didn't hear anything else. Is there anything else?

SMITH: No.

WRISTON: No, I think it's good. We can talk about it, I think it's a good start. In practice, I can see where it's going to need work in practice when we're, when we see how it works it's going to -- I can see areas that are going to raise.

LEE: We just need to adopt it before we see how it works.

WRISTON: I know that. I know. You guys just want something tonight, don't you. I don't know what we --

LEIN: You're not getting it.

WRISTON: I don't know what we can give you.

HIGBIE: Okay. Employment districts.

LEIN: Well, I have a question because I think there's been a concern expressed that we're missing three members. Do we want to continue on going through this and then revisiting this again Thursday night with the other members or not? I think, Sonja, do you know, will we have a full Commission on Thursday?

WISER: I don't know yet. We should.

WRISTON: I think we will.

WISER: We should have at least four.

LEE: No, we won't.

SMITH: I won't be here.

LEIN: Carey won't be here. Another Thursday meeting missed. Does Betty Sue know?

WRISTON: Almost a full Commission.

LEIN: Well, do we want to go on?

DELEISSEGUES: No, I don't think so. I think we need to wait until we've got more people here.

WRISTON: Well, I don't -- I mean the only -- one thing I will say that it might behoove waiting is there's not a whole lot of --

LEE: I mean, really, the OC, BP, rural industrial land bank, residential in-fill are pretty straightforward.

WRISTON: Yeah. No, that's why I'm saying maybe we just next Thursday give a quick highlight of what we presented today and then pick up here because it won't take long to get through these I don't think. I know. I know. You're looking at me like --

LEE: That's what we thought tonight.

WRISTON: I know. Well, you know.

LEIN: Actually you're lucky we didn't have a full Commission here tonight.

WRISTON: Yeah. That's why we make the big bucks. You know, that's why they finally broke down and decided we should get \$25 a meeting because we're so thorough.

LEIN: Do you want to cut it off?

SMITH: Yes.

LEIN: It sounds like it. Continue the hearing till Thursday night here?

LEE: It's at City Hall I believe.

WISER: City Hall.

LEIN: City Hall.

LEE: And we have a work session Thursday that is on the Home Occupations Ordinance.

WRISTON: Which we're still planning on hearing on the 20th, right, because we're going to be done?

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: You're going to hold that dream, aren't you?

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: We're getting there.

LEIN: One thing I didn't do, we received minutes of September 25th and October 2nd at the last meeting. Were there any changes or additions to those minutes so we can get those adopted?

WRISTON: Where did you get those?

LEIN: At the last meeting.

WRISTON: I don't remember getting those at the last meeting.

LEIN: Should we hold off on them --

WRISTON: Yeah. No, I honestly don't I mean.

LEE: Okay. Can I kind of recap where we are for Thursday night?

LEIN: Certainly.

LEE: Perhaps we can approve the minutes of the 25th and the 2nd of October and maybe we'll have the 9th of October by then. Maybe. Maybe.

WRISTON: I apologize, I probably stuck it with testimony and stuff we got that night that we've been through. I mean I guarantee you it's rubber banded here somewhere so.

LEE: Is there any further discussion on Thursday night that we need on the comprehensive plan text? I think a lot of the points that you raised, Jeff, I said that maybe as we work through the land use mapping issues those things would play themselves out.

WRISTON: Yeah. I think we ought to acknowledge those points were raised and then I think that was a great point that you brought up so that might be worth bringing up. Other than that I don't --

LEE: Okay. Then so after the approval of minutes we would be able to move on to -- did you want us to recap the discussion of urban holding and mixed use for Commissioners not present?

WRISTON: I mean we really didn't get into, we really didn't get into the discussion of urban holding. I mean we got into it in kind of sideways on the urban holding 40 and I just kind of raised it, but it wasn't really the right time anyway, so we really didn't get into that discussion I don't think anyway.

LEIN: I think the discussion will be based on the one sheet and how it's laid out and --

WRISTON: The language.

LEIN -- whether we adopt that, the language itself there.

LEE: Okay. And then we will review the OC, BP zones, rural industrial land bank, residential in-fill.

WRISTON: Yes. And the concept of whether or not -- I mean the whole urban holding concept is based on whether or not we recommend and whether the, how the Commissioners handle whether we look at this as waiting. I mean the whole -- my understanding is the whole urban holding concept is based on the fact we don't have a supportable capital facilities plan.

HIGBIE: Not entirely.

WRISTON: Not entirely. Okay. Well, I know, yeah, that's true, not entirely, I understand. I guess I understand that given the City of Vancouver's testimony.

LEIN: Well, and it's a continuation of what we adopted in '94.

HIGBIE: Correct.

LEIN: Now that was more known as urban reserve at the time, wasn't it?

HIGBIE: No.

LEIN: No?

HIGBIE: Urban holding.

LEIN: Urban reserve.

WRISTON: The legal argument is based on that; right? Then there's the --

LOWRY: Well, there are --

WRISTON: We do need to discuss it more.

LOWRY: There are a variety of reasons for urban holding. The one that is totally legal at this point is if you're going to adopt the land use map this year, you need to put it in holding because of the capital facilities plans. But in addition to that the smaller cities have historically had their UGAs be put in holding so annexation has to proceed in general urban development. The City of Vancouver is aggressively trying to get a stronger holding policy for them so there is either annexation, incorporation or a joint subarea planning effort.

WRISTON: But then that leads into the whole discussion of multiple service providers and all those things?

LOWRY: Yes. Right. I mean it's pretty simple, I think it's a pretty simple issue for the outlying cities.

WRISTON: Yeah, I'd agree on that. If I could make a suggestion, I think it might be a good idea to have a short staff presentation on the whole -- I mean I think, I think this is a big enough issue that maybe we figure out a time either in the beginning or at some point in the hearing have a quick presentation from staff on the history of it, the legal standpoints of it, the City of Vancouver's position on it, and then go into a specific discussion just related to that. Does that, you know, does that make sense?

LEIN: I'm sure we can.

WRISTON: You know, I mean it doesn't have to be a long presentation, but then we can go into an actual discussion, full discussion devoted to nothing but this urban holding concept. Does that make sense or is that --

LEE: No, we can certainly do that, I'm just trying to, I'm just trying to sequence things. When would you want to take that on?

WRISTON: When that time would be appropriate I don't know. I mean I don't know exactly when that time would be appropriate, but rather than get into like tonight where we got, we spilled into it because urban holding was mentioned because of the urban holding

40 and I came in a few minutes after the break and heard urban holding and --

LEIN: Freaked out.

WRISTON: -- jumped in there.

LEIN: Well, I think Pat's suggestion of how to look at the other boundaries and see how it starts impacting things we'll have a better understanding as that continues along.

WRISTON: But not on urban holding I don't think though.

LEIN: It may. It may have some influence on --

LEE: Well, to some extent, yes. I mean the City of Vancouver has clearly stated they feel that there is no need to expand the Vancouver UGA except for the portion between Camas and Vancouver.

WRISTON: So maybe we want to save the urban holding towards the end then as well.

LEE: Okay. So queuing up for Thursday.

WRISTON: No. I don't know. I guess I'm throwing out -- I mean it's, we're saying that maybe it's until we get through --

LEE: I think clearly urban holding is caught up in the whole discussion of capital facilities to a great extent, though not solely for that reason, so it could be done at that point. So maybe we'll approve minutes, perhaps we can then get the feedback from the Board on the site-specific requests and you can give us direction where you want to go on that, which is we're going to consider, you know, we don't wish to consider or we're going to consider X and Y, whatever, and then we'd have to -- if we're going to consider some, we're going to have to do a separate public notice, separate hearing, which probably will mean another special meeting in December for you, then we can finish up the Code changes and then we can get into the mapping discussion. Okay.

LEIN: We'll stay on task. Sounds agreeable.

WRISTON: Yeah. No, that's a good start. See how far we get.

LEE: All the way through mapping changes.

WRISTON: Yeah. Yeah.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SWmin 11-03-03